

Original Instrument

In its entirety, duly rejected for due cause, without dishonor, backs due verification and validation, with signature and seal, of presenter's due: 1. Identification; 2. Authority; 3. Authorization; and, 4. Indorsement.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

December 12, 2017
Heather Ann Tucci-Jarraf

See also:
Hatj ref #s:

18, 43, 48, 49, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 61, 65, and 66.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

RKB ref #s: 18, 19, 42, 45, 50, 51, 52, 57

Plaintiff,

all restated and incorporated by reference as if set forth in full.

v.

Nos.: 3:17-CR-82-TAV-CCS-1

3:17-CR-82-TAV-CCS-2

RANDALL KEITH BEANE, and
HEATHER ANN TUCCI-JARRAF,

Defendants.

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

This criminal matter is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation (the "R&R") entered by United States Magistrate Judge C. Clifford Shirley, Jr., on November 16, 2017 [Doc. 62]. In the R&R, Magistrate Judge Shirley recommends that the Court deny the defendants' motion to dismiss the indictment [Doc. 43] and deny the defendants' many supplemental filings purporting to void the indictment and other parts of the record [Docs. 42, 45, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57]. On November 30, defendant Tucci-Jarraf filed a *pro se* document which the Court construes as raising objections to the R&R [Doc. 65]. Then, on December 1, defendant Tucci-Jarraf filed a "Declaration of Receipt, No Receipt, and Service," which the Court also construes as raising objections to the R&R [Doc. 66].¹ Defendant Beane has moved to join both of defendant Tucci-Jarraf's filings,

¹ In this filing, defendant Tucci-Jarraf asserts that she was served with a copy of the R&R on November 17, 2017 [Doc. 66 p. 1]. If so, then both documents were properly filed within the fourteen-day window for objections to the R&R. See Fed. R. Crim. P. 59(b)(2). The Court assumes this to be the case for purpose of this opinion.

asserting they are similarly situated in that defendant Beane also believes the Court lacks jurisdiction over him [Docs. 63, 67–68]. Finding defendant Beane’s motions to join to be well-taken, the Court will grant those motions.

The district court must conduct a *de novo* review of those portions of a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation to which a party objects, unless the objections are frivolous, conclusive, or general. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Crim. P. 59(b)(3); *Smith v. Detroit Fed’n of Teachers, Local 231*, 829 F.2d 1370, 1373 (6th Cir. 1987); *Mira v. Marshall*, 806 F.2d 636, 637 (6th Cir. 1986). “The parties have ‘the duty to pinpoint those portions of the magistrate’s report that the district court must specially consider.’” *Mira*, 806 F.2d at 637 (quoting *Nettles v. Wainwright*, 677 F.2d 404, 410 (5th Cir. 1982)). “[A]bsent compelling reasons,” parties may not “raise at the district court stage new arguments or issues that were not presented to the magistrate.” *Murr v. United States*, 200 F.3d 895, 902 n.1 (6th Cir. 2000) (citing *United States v. Waters*, 158 F.3d 933, 936 (6th Cir. 1998)); *see also Marshall v. Chater*, 75 F.3d 1421, 1426–27 (10th Cir. 1996) (“[I]ssues raised for the first time in objections to the magistrate judge’s recommendation are deemed waived.”). The Court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations” of the magistrate judge. § 636(b)(1).

Here, the Court finds that it need not conduct a *de novo* review of any portion of the R&R because the defendants’ “objections” are frivolous, conclusive, and general. In her first filing, defendant Tucci-Jarraf merely obtained a copy of the R&R, handwrote ambiguous remarks on the top and bottom of each page, signed and marked each page with

a red fingerprint, and refiled the altered document with the Clerk of Court [Doc. 65]. Although these remarks are difficult to read, almost all are some variant of the following: “*Original Instrument* Entirety, Duly rejected, without dishonor, for due cause. Lacks due verification and validation, with signature and seal, or presenter’s [unknown word]: 1. Identification; 2. Authority; 3. Authorization; and, 4. Indorsement” [*Id.* at 1]. Defendant Tucci-Jarraf also lists the CM/ECF numbers of numerous docket entries in this case, without elaboration [*Id.* at 1, 16]. And, on the last page of the R&R, she has circled Magistrate Judge Shirley’s signature and included the following remark: “**Special note: Doc 55, and Doc 54, and specifically ‘FINAL NOTICE,’ restated, still in effect, and effect w/ clarification: not ledgered against any individuals” [*Id.* at 16].

In her second filing, defendant Tucci-Jarraf explains the circumstances under which she received a copy of the R&R by U.S. mail, purchased a certified copy of the same from the Clerk of Court with additional CM/ECF markers, and then filed a physically altered version with the Clerk on December 1 [Doc. 66 pp. 1–2]. Defendant Tucci-Jarraf asserts that she has “duly rejected, without dishonor, for due cause,” the R&R on the ground that neither Magistrate Judge Shirley nor the Clerk provided “due markings, inclusive of due identification, date, indorsement, certification, validation, or verification” [*Id.* at 2].²

² Defendant Tucci-Jarraf also complains that she incurred “unreasonable extra costs” by having to file these documents via personal service because the Clerk’s office informed her on November 30 that no personnel were available to electronically file the documents [Doc. 66 p. 2]. She has also attached documentation of these costs [*Id.* at 25–27]. This complaint does not appear to be an objection to the R&R itself; nor does defendant Tucci-Jarraf request any relief from the Court on this point. Thus, the Court does not consider this issue here.

Defendant Tucci-Jarraf has also attached altered and unaltered versions of the R&R and copies of email correspondence among the parties [*Id.* at 6–24]. She does not, however, raise any additional substantive objections to the R&R.

The Court first notes that Magistrate Judge Shirley included a proper electronic signature on the final page of the R&R [Doc. 62 p. 16]. No other form of “due verification and validation” is required by any federal rule or statute of which the Court is aware, and defendants have not cited to any such requirement. Indeed, Rule 11 of the Eastern District of Tennessee Electronic Case Filing Rules and Procedures expressly provides as follows: “Any order or other court-issued document filed electronically without the handwritten signature of a judge or clerk has the same force and effect as if the judge or clerk had signed a paper copy of the document and it had been entered on the docket in paper form.” Further, defendant Tucci-Jarraf never specifies *how* Magistrate Judge Shirley and the Clerk should have verified the R&R. Moreover, beyond this issue, defendant Tucci-Jarraf’s remarks offer no legal or factual argument the Court could properly consider, and they certainly do not “pinpoint those portions of the [R&R]” under objection. *Mira*, 806 F.2d at 637 (quoting *Nettles*, 677 F.2d at 404). The Court is, frankly, unclear what these objections mean, if intended as objections at all. The Court is, of course, mindful of its duty to “liberally construe the briefs of *pro se* litigants and apply less stringent standards to parties proceeding *pro se*.” *Bouyer v. Simon*, 22 F. App’x 611, 612 (6th Cir. 2001). But having searched defendant Tucci-Jarraf’s filings for any substantive objection to the R&R, the Court is unable to locate any issue it could subject to *de novo* review.

pg. 41 of 44

Nevertheless, the Court has independently reviewed the R&R and is in complete agreement with Magistrate Judge Shirley's recommendations, which the Court adopts and incorporates into this ruling. Accordingly, the Court **ACCEPTS IN WHOLE** the R&R [Doc. 62]. Defendant Beane's motions [Docs. 63, 67-68] to join the filings of defendant Tucci-Jarraf are hereby **GRANTED**. Furthermore, to the extent they may be considered motions, the defendants' motion to dismiss the indictment [Doc. 43] and supplemental filings purporting to void the indictment and other parts of the record [Docs. 42, 45, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57] are all hereby **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Thomas A. Varlan
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

In its entirety, duly rejected, without dishonor, for due cause. Lacks due verification and validation, with due signature and seal, of presenter's due:

1. Identification; 2. authority; 3. authorization; and, 4. indorsement.

*See also: natj ref #'s: 13, 43, 48, 49, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 64, 65, and 66.
AKB ref #'s: 13, 19, 42, 45, 50, 51, 52, 57.*

all restated and incorporated by reference as it set forth in full.

FINAL NOTICE: Doc 55 and 54, specially and specifically, "FINAL NOTICE", restated, is still in effect and affect, with continued clarification that all ledgered entries are not against any individuals, or Originals.

*Further Notice: Entire ^{alleged} Clerk of Court records, inclusive of all book keeping and transactional records, alleged FBI records, USSS records, and all other records of USA agencies, departments, subsidiaries, and outposts are all duly accepted as proof of particular domestic actors and specific foreign interests subversion, for immediate reveal to the public, inclusive of witness testimony, inclusive of witness testimony of said subversion to be revealed 5 December 12, 2017
By Heather Ann Tucci-Jarraf.*

Heather Ann Tucci-Jarraf

** original instrument **
Duly rejected, without dishonor, for due cause.

December 12, 2017
Heather Ann Tucci-Jarraf

From: tned_cm-ecf@tned.uscourts.gov [mailto:tned_cm-ecf@tned.uscourts.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, December 05, 2017 3:53 PM
To: tned_Courtmail@tned.uscourts.gov
Subject: Activity in Case 3:17-cr-00082-TAV-CCS USA v. Beane et al (TV1) Order on Motion to Dismiss

This is an automatic e-mail message generated by the CM/ECF system. Please DO NOT RESPOND to this e-mail because the mail box is unattended.

NOTE TO PUBLIC ACCESS USERS There is no charge for viewing opinions.

Live Database

U.S. District Court – Eastern District of Tennessee

Notice of Electronic Filing

The following transaction was entered on 12/5/2017 at 3:53 PM EST and filed on 12/5/2017

Case Name:

USA v. Beane et al (TV1)

Case Number:

3:17-cr-00082-TAV-CCS

Filer:

Document Number:

69

Docket Text:

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER as to Randall Keith Beane (1), and Heather Ann Tucci-Jarraf (2); the Court ACCEPTS IN WHOLE the R&R Doc. [62]. Defendant Beanes motions Docs. [63], [67][68] to join the filings of

pg. 6 of 11

defendant Tucci-Jarraf are hereby GRANTED. Furthermore, to the extent they may be considered motions, the defendants motion to dismiss the indictment Doc. [43] and supplemental filings purporting to void the indictment and other parts of the record Docs. [42], [45], [48], [49], [50], [51], [52], [53], [54], [55], [56], [57] are all hereby DENIED. Signed by Chief District Judge Thomas A Varlan on December 5, 2017. (JAN,)Copies mailed to pro se parties

3:17-cr-00082-TAV-CCS-1 Notice has been electronically mailed to:

Francis L Lloyd, Jr FLLlloydJr@gmail.com,
LloydLawOff@gmail.com, M.Denise.DuBose@gmail.com

Cynthia F Davidson cynthia.davidson@usdoj.gov,
CaseView.ECF@usdoj.gov,
USATNE.ECFKnoxCrim@usdoj.gov,
paige.chiaro@usdoj.gov, shannon.green@usdoj.gov,
sonya.hardin@usdoj.gov, terrie.scharer@usdoj.gov

Stephen G McGrath lawyer.mcgrath@yahoo.com

Anne-Marie Svolto anne-marie.svolto@usdoj.gov,
CaseView.ECF@usdoj.gov,
USATNE.ECFchattcrim@usdoj.gov,
donna.qualls@usdoj.gov, gail.holt@usdoj.gov,
jeanette.sorey@usdoj.gov, joshua.kelly2@usdoj.gov,
kris.eslinger@usdoj.gov, laura.clapp@usdoj.gov,
stephanie.morris@usdoj.gov, terrie.scharer@usdoj.gov

pg. 7 of 11

3:17-cr-00082-TAV-CCS-1 Notice has been delivered by other means to:

Randall Keith Beane
52505-074
BLOUNT COUNTY
DETENTION CENTER
920 E LAMAR ALEXANDER PARKWAY
MARYVILLE, TN 37804

3:17-cr-00082-TAV-CCS-2 Notice has been electronically mailed to:

Francis L Lloyd, Jr FLLloydJr@gmail.com,
LloydLawOff@gmail.com, M.Denise.DuBose@gmail.com

Cynthia F Davidson cynthia.davidson@usdoj.gov,
CaseView.ECF@usdoj.gov,
USATNE.ECFKnoxCrim@usdoj.gov,
paige.chiaro@usdoj.gov, shannon.green@usdoj.gov,
sonya.hardin@usdoj.gov, terrie.scharer@usdoj.gov

Stephen G McGrath lawyer.mcgrath@yahoo.com

Anne-Marie Svolto anne-marie.svolto@usdoj.gov,
CaseView.ECF@usdoj.gov,
USATNE.ECFchattcrim@usdoj.gov,
donna.qualls@usdoj.gov, gail.holt@usdoj.gov,
jeanette.sorey@usdoj.gov, joshua.kelly2@usdoj.gov,
kris.eslinger@usdoj.gov, laura.clapp@usdoj.gov,
stephanie.morris@usdoj.gov, terrie.scharer@usdoj.gov

3:17-cr-00082-TAV-CCS-2 Notice has been delivered by

Pg. 8 of 11

other means to:

Heather Ann Tucci-Jarraf

105 Orchard Lane

Oak Ridge, TN 37830

The following document(s) are associated with this transaction:

Document description:Main Document

Original filename:n/a

Electronic document Stamp:

[STAMP dcecfStamp_ID=1062680380 [Date=12/5/2017]

[FileNumber=3463237-0

]

[50837551998e7878a7f5e0503651f2796875cd8ba545891a6

5f3c8ae7554fd0dd35

4c86ff59388be1a412101c58a0e42dfd4d9819d04278553f47

81d5ef824bb]]

pg. 9 of 11

Heather Ann Tucci-Jarraf
105 Orchard Lane
Oak Ridge, TN 37830

** Original Instrument **

July rejected, without dishonor, for due cause.

December 12, 2017

Heather Ann Tucci-Jarraf

Pg. 10 of 11

EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
OFFICE OF
CLERK, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
800 MARKET ST., SUITE 130
KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE 37902
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

neopost
12/05/2017
US POSTAGE

FIRST-CLASS MAIL

\$00.67⁰



ZIP 37902
041L11218262

*Rec'd
12-7-17
naty*

3783033604 C008



Certificate of Service

I certify that on December 12, 2017, this original instrument, "REJECTION", was duly issued and caused to be delivered by personal service to the alleged Clerk of Court. Furthermore, said REJECTIONS was duly scanned, with certified copy out, and said scan of this original instrument was caused to be filed and entered electronically. Notice of this filing is sent by operation of the alleged Court's electronic filing system to all alleged parties indicated on the electronic filing receipt. Alleged parties may access this filing through the alleged Court's electronic filing system.

With further due notice and certification made and given that I am not responsible, accountable, or liable for any actions, or no-actions, of the alleged Clerk of Court, her alleged deputies, and alleged office, and the electronic filing system they access, utilize, and manage.

12-12-17

Original

12-12-17
